

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed on June 17, 2004. Claims 1-2, 4-6, and 8-12 are now pending in this application. Claims 3, and 7 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended to better define Applicants' claimed invention. Specifically, claim 1 includes the allowable subject matter of claim 3. Claim 6 includes the allowable subject matter of claim 7 and claim 11 includes the allowable subject matter of claim 3. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendment.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 6, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ding (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,626).

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4-5 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ding (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,626) in view of Wells et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,310,915). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Discussion of Prior Art

The Ding reference fails to disclose or suggest each of Applicants' claimed elements as currently amended.

The Ding reference discloses a signal filtering and compression mechanism for encoding digital video signals according to digital video standards (Col. 1 lines 6-8). Ding is silent with respect to a method for reducing noise in a video distribution system comprising applying motion compensated temporal filtering to compressed image data using motion vectors previously generated during compression of the image data. The filtering is adapted to reduce noise in the compressed image data and the need for regeneration of the motion vectors during the filtering step is eliminated. Adaptive spatial filtering is applied to compressed image data and a lookup table is provided for determining values for β (backward) and β (forward), corresponding to values between 0 and 1, based on a difference of pixel amplitudes, as set forth in Applicants'

amended claims 1 and 11. The Ding reference is silent with respect to an adaptive spatial filtering method comprising an arithmetic manipulation of input and output pixel values within a current frame, a weighted mean value for a group of pixels on said frame, and a filter coefficient, α , wherein said weighted mean value is determined from a table comprising pixel amplitude values of a number of specified pixels within a predetermined region as set forth in Applicants' amended claim 6.

Applicants' invention as set forth is not rendered obvious by the combination of the Ding reference and the Wells et al. reference. The Ding reference merely teaches a signal filtering and compression mechanism for encoding digital video signals according to digital video standards (Col. 1, lines 6-8).

The Wells et al. reference does not remedy the defects of Ding. The Wells et al. reference teaches a method for transcoding a previously encoded video signal, to a second encoded representation. The re-encoding and encoding can occur in a statistical multiplexing context. The encoding parameter may be a channel rate on which transfer of the re-encoded video signal to a channel depends. The model of the decoder buffer is altered to fill at the channel rate indicated by the parameter (Abstract and Col. 6, lines 31-44).

The combination of the Ding reference and the Wells et al. references fails to teach or remotely suggest a method for reducing noise in a video distribution system as claimed by Applicants.

In view of the above, Applicants' respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not anticipated by the Ding reference (or rendered obvious by the combination of the Ding and the Wells et al. references) or any of the other prior art references of record, taken alone or in combination. The prior art simply fails to teach or suggest the noise reduction system and associated features of Applicants' claimed invention. Moreover, since independent claims 1 and 6 are not anticipated or rendered obvious, then the claims dependent thereon are believed to be allowable.


Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between Applicants' claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the foregoing discussion. Applicants' silence as to

any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, entry of the present amendment and reconsideration and allowance of each of the claims is respectfully requested. If there are any remaining issues that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew D. Gathy
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 46,441
Law Office of Barry R. Lipsitz
755 Main Street
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 459-0200

Attorney Docket No.: GIC-643
Date: August 19, 2004